REMARKS

Claims 1-17 were rejected, and claims 18-20 were allowed. By way of this amendment, claims 1 and 8 have been canceled, and claims 2-4, 6-11, and 13 have been amended. Entry of the amendment is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-17 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 5,400,246 (Wilson). In light of the amendments and the following remarks, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration.

Claim 2

Claim 2 has been amended to be in independent form. Claim 2 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wilson. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection because Wilson does not disclose, teach, or suggest all the elements of claim 2.

For example, claim 2 recites "uniquely associating the plurality of device conditions for the HART device with one of a status condition associated with a failure of the HART device, a status condition associated with maintenance of the HART device and a status condition associated with an advisable action in connection with the HART device." Wilson does not disclose, teach, or suggest this element, among others.

The Office Action asserted that Wilson discloses this element because "the entire premise of the system of Wilson is the monitoring, detecting, advising, displaying and correcting of faults of monitored devices in the system." *Office Action* at p. 4. Applicants respectfully traverse this assertion.

Wilson describes a control system in which devices such as temperature sensors, smoke detector sensors, window sensors, etc., provide measurement data to a personal computer. *See Wilson* at Abstract; col. 4, lines 9-13; Figs. 1 and 2. The measurement data represent variables being monitored by the control system such as a temperature, whether smoke is detected, whether a window has been broken, etc. *See id.* at col. 6, lines 32-37; col. 9, lines 54-64; col. 10, lines 22-29. A user can then use software to set up Boolean logic condition statements to specify conditions of the measurement data that will cause an output to change. *See id.* at col. 5, lines 6-12; col. 6, lines 32-43; col. 17, lines

15-37. For example, the user can specify that an alarm be sounded when an inside motion detector is activated (indicating motion inside a building) shortly after a window sensor is activated (indicating window broken). *See id.* at col. 6, lines 32-40.

Thus, contrary to the assertion of the Office Action, the entire premise of the system of Wilson is <u>not</u> "the monitoring, detecting, advising, displaying and correcting of <u>faults of monitored devices</u> in the system." Rather, Wilson merely describes a control system that receives from sensors data indicative of the variables being sensed (e.g., temperature) and makes control decisions based upon that data. Wilson does not appear to teach, for example, that particular data received from a sensor is interpreted as a fault of the sensor itself.

Moreover, Wilson does not teach, disclose, or suggest "uniquely associating the plurality of device conditions for the HART device with one of a status condition associated with <u>a failure of the HART device</u>, a status condition associated with <u>maintenance of the HART device</u> and a status condition associated with <u>an advisable action in connection with the HART device</u>." For example, Wilson does not appear to teach anything about associating a sensor condition with a status condition associated with a failure of the sensor itself (what the Examiner alleges corresponds to the "HART device").

Because Wilson does not disclose, teach, or suggest this element, among others, claim 2 is allowable over Wilson.

Other Claims

It is respectfully asserted that independent claims 9 and 14 are allowable at least for reasons similar to those discussed above with respect to claim 2.

By way of this amendment, claims 3-7 now depend from claim 2. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 3-7 are allowable at least for the same reasons discussed above with respect to claim 2.

By way of this amendment, claims 10-13 now depend from claim 9. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 10-13 are allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 9.

Claims 15-17 depend from claim 14. Applicants respectfully assert that claims 15-17 are allowable at least for the same reasons as claim 14.

Conclusion

In view of the above, each of the presently pending claims in this application is believed to be in immediate condition for allowance. Accordingly, the Examiner is respectfully requested to pass this application to issue.

Dated: October 12, 2004

Respectfully submitted,

By _____
Gregory E. Stanton
Registration No.: 45,127
MARSHALL, GERSTEIN & BORUN LLP
233 S. Wacker Drive, Suite 6300
Sears Tower
Chicago, Illinois 60606-6357
(312) 474-6300
Attorney for Applicants